

ALAN WATT BLURB (i.e. Educational Talk):
" "ROLL UP, ROLL UP!
TUNE IN TO THE BODY PART GAME-SHOW MACABRE"
and
"CHEMICAL EVOLUTION TO "PERFECT" WOMEN
(THE END OF A PERIOD IN TIME)" "
May 31, 2007

**Dialogue Copyrighted Alan Watt - May 31, 2007 (Exempting
Music and Literary Quotes)**

WWW.CUTTINGTHROUGHTHEMATRIX.COM

www.alanwattsentientsentinel.eu

Hi folks. I'm Alan Watt. This is cuttingthroughthematrix.com and alanwattsentientsentinel.eu on May 31st, 2007.

Years ago, there was a movie put out called "***Running Man***," a futuristic movie with predictive programming, as they all do, in fact, getting us used to an idea where sports would evolve into blood-sports. "***Rollerball***" was another one along the same vein, the first "***Rollerball***," where a world corporation ran the world. You had three groups of people: Those who were in the corporation at the top; the lesser bureaucrats, who dealt with the public and gave them their entertainment; and then, the people at the bottom, who simply lived for blood-sports, like the Gladiators did; and the crowds went to see them in ancient Rome.

In other words, because culture and reality are mandated from the top, any changes are authorized from the top down; then, any culture can become the normal if it's introduced in the right way. And more importantly, it's better to make sure the public have their indoctrination, gradually, towards the idea of acceptance of it, so that when it's brought on the scene, it becomes normal to them, quite easily.

Culture is plastic; it's fluid, almost. It's not static. The culture that's given, from the top, must fit the times you live in. It's tailor-made for the times that you live in. Long before the public even got hold of a computer for their home, there were articles in the newspapers talking about this new revolution. Revolution—a very important word, since those behind it are very old with their societies. They love revolution. Most revolutions are not bloody—they're cultural.

They spoke and said that this revolution would change the world, how everyone would have to adapt to it. It was a mandate, in other words. They also talked about information wars, before the public were given the computer; so for those people who think they're on the cutting edge, there's nothing that you're given that's there to help you. They would never give you what would be regarded as a weapon, when they have already declared this a cultural war, an information war. They're very serious when they use these terms, like "the war on poverty," "the

war on drugs," "the war on seatbelts," et cetera. They mean it. Therefore, when they gave you the Internet, they already had it planned that they would dominate it; and they do. The biggest sites out there that fascinate you (no doubt, with sex or Atlantis stories, et cetera) are dominated by those who are making war on your mind and the culture, as they upgrade the culture.

When you want to do horrible things to humanity, you must have a dehumanized humanity. The process of dehumanization can be brought on insidiously or fairly quickly, depending on how much time and effort they put in to creating the new reality.

It might surprise people that before the 1920's, sports teams were just local teams that played games for free. They were little clubs, little hobby clubs. The big writers came out and said how they would make sports national pastimes (addictions, really) and arenas. Arena, remember, comes from ancient Rome. Arena is AARON, because there's much more behind the old terms you're given, than face value would allow.

Societies which are to be vastly changed and dominated by ruthless people, must therefore give a culture which is dehumanized and pretty well dysfunctional, in a sense. Everyone must be divided, separated from everyone else. Man from woman, parents from children and generation from generation. Very carefully done through specialized scientific indoctrination, followed by massive propaganda, daily, on all media.

Once the people are dehumanized, you can do anything with them. You can bring anything in, no matter how horrific it would have sounded in a previous time, it will be accepted by the public. Once the public accepts dehumanization and join in the gruesome fest that's dished up to them, with fascination, then true horror will breakout within society and no one will care; it's now normal.

In Monty Python's "***The Meaning of Life***," it starts off with a spoof, after the hospital drama, where men visit the homes asking for kidneys and livers from donors, as a routine thing. We have seen, as the people have started to believe the science, they've replaced old religions with sciences. The sciences are taught as religions. They're authoritarian. They, like all religions, will accept no opposition to their theories, which are taught as facts. They want total power over everyone, with the excuse that their religion, this science, is therefore logic. It's no different from previous times, when great churches would come out with their theories and give you formats of how to live. It's the same process. Anyone who opposed that was condemned, because **all those who become gods, in this old world, will tolerate no other gods before them.** Nothing really changes, just the garments they wear.

We've all been subjected to documentaries, over the years, on countries like the Philippines, where wealthy people from across the world can order kidneys, for instance, when they need a transplant, from healthy people. How the big surgeons, mainly from the U.S., go over, pay the donor a paltry sum, take the kidney and sell it and replace it to the recipient (the one with the big money). It's a going business. Then you see the one who was the donor in the first place, who spends the little bit they've got, and people who are living in abject poverty, you see them having to spend the little bit they've got on medical treatment, because of all the

side-effects and infections that set in and so on.

This, also, even the showing of this, is a dehumanizing process, because we're left with no answer. There is no debate about it. Is it right? wrong? Laws are never passed to stop it, the exploitation of the poor. However, what does come to pass is that the public, after various shows, programs and documentaries on the subject, begin to accept it. **What they're actually accepting is their own dehumanization.**

Compassion is neutralized, when you see injustice carried out, you expect justice and it doesn't happen. The people become bitter, hardened or simply discompassionate; and lots of these programs, collectively, help to dehumanize us. You'll hear ordinary people who live and get every idea from television, by watching documentaries, parrot verbatim what the Big Boys say, "There's too many people on the planet. We're just another animal. We can't go on like this, et cetera, et cetera." It would never dawn on them to do their own research on anything that's given to them. They're accepting dehumanization, and agreeing with the Big Boys, "there's just too many people." However, I wonder if the Big Boys will ever volunteer, first, to euthanize themselves so that others may live; and that's the day where pigs might fly.

Another way to help this dehumanizing process, to get us to accept it, is to do what they've done on comedy and movies, long ago; and that's to present it in a show fashion, a game show fashion, just like "***The Running Man.***"

In the "***Daily Mail***," from England, and this is from the **30th of May 2007**; (may be the 31st of May 2007), is an article, which is probably happening in other countries. It's just that you don't hear about other countries with similar articles. We think we're always isolated, but you'll find that, generally, things are happening across the world at the same time, in all countries, somewhere.

This article by **Allan Hall** says this:

"Patients waiting for transplant organs have condemned a Dutch TV reality show, in which a dying woman will choose a patient to receive one of her kidneys. The National Kidney Federation spoke out as broadcaster BNN vowed to go ahead with the controversial live show this Friday, despite efforts by Dutch MPs to ban it. Behind the scenes, the board of the private TV company was under massive pressure to drop the show, which MPs said was damaging Holland's international reputation."

It goes on to say:

"Today as plans are unveiled in Brussels to improve the organ-donor network across Europe, TV producers from Endemol, the company behind the Big Brother reality shows, are putting the finishing touches to The Big Donor Show. Ray Mackey, 43, co-chairman of the UK National Kidney Federation, who received a kidney transplant two years ago, said the concept of the show was "totally abhorrent". "It just seems that it is totally the shock factor that they are going for," he said.

Three contestants between 18 and 40, armed with professionally made

movies about their lives, loves and aspirations, will compete to win the approval of a 37-year-old woman with an inoperable brain tumour, who has been told she will die before the end of the year.

With the help of viewer votes, the woman, known only as Lisa, will decide which contestant deserves her kidney. Mr. Mackey said Endemol had not taken into account the huge psychological blow the two losers would have to deal with. "To go through that traumatic thing on the television, it just doesn't bear thinking about," he added.

Timothy Statham, the federation's chief executive, said the show was a travesty that threatened the organ transplants system, which depended on acts of altruism. Professor John Feehally, who has just ended his term as president of Britain's Renal Association, said: "The scenario portrayed in this programme is ethically totally unacceptable. "The show will not further understanding of transplants. "Instead it will cause confusion and anxiety."

BNN TV, which is based at Hilversum near Amsterdam, appears to be basking in the worldwide publicity. It claims it is provoking debate on an important issue, and says the programme is partly "in tribute" to the station's founder, who died of kidney failure. "We know that this programme is super controversial and some people will think it's tasteless, but we think the reality is even more shocking and tasteless: waiting for an organ is just like playing the lottery," Laurens Drillich, chairman of the BNN network, said. With the massive publicity generated, the Big Donor Show could become one of the most watched TV programmes ever.

The show is planned as a one-off, but Dutch TV industry sources speculated that if viewing figures made it a success, there would be little to stop it acting as a pilot for a series of similar "give me a transplant" type shows. The identities of the donor and would-be recipients are to be revealed when the 80-minute show starts at 8.30pm on Friday. Viewers will be urged to text in their votes, and Lisa will consider their verdict before making the decision on her own about who gets her organs.

BNN has the potential to make hundreds of thousands of pounds in profits on the text messages alone. The broadcaster has brought entertainment to new lows in Holland, with another of its programmes showing drug taking, live sex acts and women testing sex toys. Joop Atsma, an MP with the ruling CDA party, met education minister Ronald Plasterk in an attempt to have the show stopped. "I want to block this. This is truly not permissible," Mr Atsma said. "It would be a victory for decency and common sense if this were not screened." But Mr Plasterk told the Dutch parliament that the constitution forbade him from declaring an outright ban on the show. A spokesman for Endemol in Britain said that, although there was no legal bar to presenting such a programme here, the company had no plans to do so."

Alan: It's quite something, the world we live in, you know, because even "***The Daily Mail***," with all of its tabloid nonsense. Just look at the ads on the sides of the page, with its usual Hollywood drama stuff and who's doing what to whom, and then all the sex stuff. You see, **people are already dehumanized from any standard they had in the past.** This is now normal, so it's very hard to criticize something which is already portraying us as base animals. It can't really be done. It's fantasia. It's a circus. This is where the dehumanization process, inter-generationally, will take you—to a horror show. It has no option but to take you to a horror show.

From the mind of the psychopath at the top, what's happening at the bottom seems perfectly logical, because they can't identify with normal human emotions of those other people down below. They are pragmatic. They want efficiency in this world. They have told us of the world they want to bring in. They have been telling us for a long, long, long time in books they've published themselves and written themselves, which we sort of pass over, like clouds passing over our heads, as though it didn't affect us somehow, when we're the subjects of their books, the future. We are the subject of their books. We have been trained not to participate in the creation of our own reality and our destiny. We've been trained to leave it to our "betters." That's why it's so easily managed, in this day and age, by a few at the top.

The think tanks that come up with the ideas, they shape the future; they plan the future and pass it down to the lower think tanks in the pyramid structure. At one time, life was looked upon as being sacred. That was very important, because without that concept, anything could be done to humanity; and that is the brink we're on today. We're going over the brink into inhumanity.

The dialectical technique is clever to make things happen within society. For instance, how, if you want to reduce, basically, pregnancy, how would you bring in easily available abortions? It would never occur to people that you create promiscuity, massive promiscuity, because once the promiscuity comes in, the bonding process stops. That's what happens, you see, when you mate with someone, you're actually beginning the forms of a bonding, by nature, so that you can both raise children. When that's been destroyed, then the bonding is blunted. Relationships are short-lived and sex itself, intercourse becomes a simple method of alleviating a drive, temporarily; like quenching your thirst, if you're thirsty, with water.

The aftermath of all the promiscuity is massive pregnancies, all over, by young single girls. Along comes the guy or the people with the solutions, just waiting, biding their time, all prewritten, and government stamps approval, and on you go. Now we sell parts of babies, which are aborted. You can get up to \$5,000 for a good spinal column in good condition. It's quite sad, this butchery that's going on in the name of progress. Who defines progress? We should think about that. Whose progress is it and for what purpose? Because there is always purpose.

Now, with the donors, of course, that was another part to get you dehumanized, always with a tragic face—someone who needs help. In comes the solution, we can all become donors. Now it's a Lotto, it's a raffle with cheers and boos and hisses of the crowd in the big arena, as they start festing on this macabre show. One, I'm sure, of many to come. In one way or another, it all fits into the depopulation program, as we allow ourselves to be further dehumanized. "We're just animals," you see, we're animals without rights. The animals got their rights in the Earth Charter, drawn up by the Rockefellers and pushed out by Maurice Strong. We didn't get those rights.

Years ago, people said that many people would love socialism, the definition of it being, "a world run by experts, where you wouldn't have to think and decide anything for yourself." All the major problems and headaches of the world will be taken care of by your betters, and you'd be happy with it, in that way then you

could play. You could just spend your life playing.

For many, many years, even in radio talk shows across all countries, the regular AM or FM talk shows, the format has been to give you something controversial, for a topic for the day, to get everyone arguing. Then they go into the Hegelian dialectic, because people immediately take sides—this or that, and the host stirs it up. That's called "good talk radio." They can count on the public doing just that, "what side did you want to jump in on?" They already give you your answers for each side, the dialectical process. However, each topic is actually guiding you towards an acceptance of more and more of the bizarro.

When you have an ignorant population who will not research for themselves, who go beyond conspiracies, a title the elite want you to use on yourself as you search. Go beyond the conspiracies. After all, if you quote the elites' books, themselves, those who are in power and those who have been in power, their predecessors, it's hardly a conspiracy when they publish it in the open. **H.G. Wells** called it "**The Open Conspiracy**." It's there if the public want to read it; it's just not terribly exciting. It's dry reading, no sex or violence, just agenda.

Women were targeted long ago (and men) for the changes to depopulate the planet. **Charles Galton Darwin**, in "**The Next Million Years**," talked about methods of introducing hormonal changes within the male and the female to make it so. We see it happening with the lowered sperm count in the male. We see all of the reactions within the female populations. Many of them have become masculinized; and here's a further thrust to it all.

In the **BBC news**, this is from Wednesday, **23rd of May 2007**, it says this:

"US Approves pill to stop periods.

The first birth control pill designed to stop monthly periods has been approved for use in the US. The Food and Drug Administration backed continuous use of the pill, Lybrel..."

Alan: It's an interesting name. It's a play on Libra, you see. It certainly will put them out of balance. It's also a play on life or freedom; and "EL" of course is the old, old God.

"...Lybrel which is manufactured by Wyeth."

Alan: Interesting name too, Wyeth.

"Taken daily it can halt a woman's menstrual periods indefinitely, as well as prevent pregnancies. Standard contraceptive pills are designed to be taken for three weeks, followed by a week break to allow for menstruation. An FDA official warned Lybrel was not suitable for everyone. About half the women who tested it in trials dropped out before the end, citing irregular and unscheduled bleeding. The pill contains a low dose of two hormones already widely used in birth control pills, ethinyl estradiol and levonorgestrel. The continuous delivery of the hormones prevents the stimulation of a menstrual cycle."

It then goes on to:

"Bleeding

"A study showed Lybrel was just as effective in preventing pregnancy as a traditional pill called Alesse, also made by Wyeth. But it may be difficult for the women to recognise if they have become pregnant because Lybrel users will not have regular periods. Dr Vanessa Cullins, of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc, welcomed the FSA decision."

Alan: People should look into Planned Parenthood Federation, because old Margaret Sanger, who was a supporter of both Stalin and Hitler, and who was a eugenicist—she believed in the eradication of certain races—was the one who started this up. Most women think it's a champion for them. They have no idea of its real tenets.

"She said it might potentially help women whose monthly periods were blighted by headaches, tender breasts, cramps and nausea. However, Jean Elson, a sociologist at the University of New Hampshire, said: "For women in that situation, I certainly can understand the benefits of taking these kinds of medications, but for most women menstruation is a normal life event - not a medical condition. "Why medicate away a normal life event if we're not sure of the long-term effects?"

That view was echoed by health psychologist Paula Derry in a recent editorial in the British Medical Journal. She said: "A drug (that) chronically overrides the physiological changes associated with the menstrual cycle (is) creating a hormonal environment that is not found in nature."

Alan: They happen to be doing that for a long time.

"Toni Belfield, of the Family Planning Association in the UK, said: "For women who don't want to have a period often, this is a very good option."

Alan: It's very predictable, what they're going to say, isn't it?, depending on who they work for. I mean, would you go to him to ask an honest opinion?

Here is the good con, these little slogans. Remember, **Lenin said**, "**We shall win by slogans**." Well it wasn't lost on any other side, who also had already been using all these different slogans.

"It is important that contraception provides women with a choice..."

Alan: See, they make you think you've got a choice.

"...not just between different methods, but between how those methods are used." Doctors have long allowed women to skip their periods by starting a new pack of conventional pills on day 22 of their cycle, rather than waiting a week to resume the hormones."

Alan: So there you are. Just nature isn't simply good enough, as the high Masons say. They've got to perfect that which was left imperfect. Quite interesting.

Here is a report for "the choir," because it's only the choir that really follows any of this. The general population, as you know, are oblivious and don't care, and don't want to know.

This is from the "**Independent Media Center**" in Winnipeg (IMC). It's about "**North American Union plan headed in Congress in fall**," May 24th this was done. The source was "World Net Daily," **and it says:**

"A powerful think tank chaired by former Sen. Sam Nunn and guided by trustees including Richard Armitage, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Harold Brown, William Cohen and Henry Kissinger, is in the final stages of preparing a report to the White House and U.S. Congress on the benefits of integrating the U.S., Mexico and Canada into one political, economic and security bloc."

Alan: It's the same thing that Karl Marx talked about in the 1800's, which is no coincidence.

"The final report, published in English, Spanish and French, is scheduled for submission to all three governments by Sept. 30, according to the Center for Strategic & International Studies."

Alan: They have the same name as the CSIS boys here, our intelligence services. This particular CSIS, which is probably combined with it, mind you, since all intelligence agencies work for the same group.

"CSIS boasts of playing a large role in the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement in 1994 – a treaty that set in motion a political movement many believe resembles the early stages of the European Community on its way to becoming the European Union. "The results of the study will enable policymakers to make sound, strategic, long-range policy decisions about North America, with an emphasis on regional integration," explains Armand B. Peschard-Sverdrup, director of CSIS' Mexico Project. "Specifically, the project will focus on a detailed examination of future scenarios, which are based on current trends..."

Alan: They love these terms, "current trends."

*"...and involve six areas of critical importance to the trilateral relationship: labor mobility, energy, the environment, security, competitiveness and border infrastructure and logistics." **The data collected for the report is based on seven secret roundtable sessions ...***

Alan: That's how democratic we all are, you see. Why do people vote, eh?

"...The data collected for the report is based on seven secret roundtable sessions..."

Alan: The roundtable sessions are members of the Royal Institute for International Affairs, Canadian Institute for International Affairs, and the Council on Foreign Relations. We should remember that. They run the roundtable sessions.

"...involving between 21 and 45 people and conducted by CSIS. The

participants are politicians, business people, labor leaders and academics from all three countries with equal representation. All of this is described in a CSIS report, "North American Future 2025 Project."

Alan: And you think it's all just evolving, and the people alive then will too—if there's anybody still alive.

Now here they go:

"The free flow of people across national borders..."

Alan: That was the same wording that Karl Marx used. It's the same wording the Royal Institute of International Affairs used when they were doing all this stuff for the European integration, beginning in 1945. Actually, it was on before the Second World War; they discussed it, as Winston Churchill admitted to.

"The free flow of people across national borders will undoubtedly continue throughout the world as well as in North America, as will the social, political and economic challenges that accompany this trend," says the report. "In order to remain competitive in the global economy..."

Alan: You see, we all have to compete to the bottom, to whoever is at the lowest common denominator, we have to compete downwards.

"...it is imperative for the twenty-first century North American labor market to possess the flexibility..."

Alan: Ha, ha. I love the terms.

"...necessary to meet industrial labor demands on a transitional basis and in a way that responds to market forces." As WND reported last week, the controversial "Secure Borders, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Reform Act of 2007," which would grant millions of illegal aliens the right to stay in the U.S. under certain conditions, contains provisions for the acceleration of the Security and Prosperity Partnership,"

Alan: "Prosperity Partnership." Who is going to prosper? They won't tell you that part.

"...a plan for North American economic and defense integration..."

Alan: That's already been done. It happened after 9/11. They admitted they were already integrated.

"... and with remarkable similarities to the CSIS plan."

Alan: What a coincidence. It's all the same plan.

"The bill, as worked out by Senate and White House negotiators, cites the SPP agreement signed by President Bush and his counterparts in Mexico and Canada March 23, 2005 – an agreement that has been criticized as a blueprint for

building a European Union-style merger of the three countries of North America. "It is the sense of Congress that the United States and Mexico should accelerate the implementation of the Partnership for Prosperity..."

Alan: Ha! People will repeat these things you know in public. You'll hear them talk, Partnership for Prosperity. Slogans, "win it by slogans."

"...to help generate economic growth and improve the standard of living in Mexico, which will lead to reduced migration," the draft legislation states on page 211 on the version time-stamped May 18, 2007 11:58 p.m. Since agreement on the major provisions of the bill was announced late last week, a firestorm of opposition has ignited across the country. Senators and representatives are reporting heavy volumes of phone calls and e-mails expressing outrage with the legislation they believe represents the largest "amnesty" program ever contemplated by the federal government."

Alan: See, that's how they get you off onto a sidetrack. The immigration is only one little part of this, and I mean it. It's a little part of all of this. Your whole lifestyle, for everyone, is to be altered. It's a planned society we're talking about here. So don't get sidetracked by the supposed protesters complaining just about immigration.

"Meanwhile, while many continue to express skepticism about a plot to integrate North America along the lines of the European Union, WND reported last week that 14 years ago, one of the world's most celebrated economists and management experts said it was already on the fast track and nothing could stop it."

Alan: And that's true. It was planned long before we were born, in fact.

"Peter F. Drucker, in one of his dozens of best-selling books, "Post Capitalist Society," published in 1993, wrote that the European Community, the progenitor of the European Union, "triggered the attempt to create a North American economic community, built around the United States by integrating both Canada and Mexico into a common market."

Alan: He wasn't the first one. As I say, Karl Marx did it first, and then many of the books put out by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, both before and after World War II, talked about the same thing.

"So far this attempt is purely economic in its goal..."

Alan: Ha, ha, ha.

"...wrote the Presidential Medal of Freedom honoree. "But it can hardly remain so in the long run." Drucker describes in his book the worldwide trends toward globalization that were evident back then – the creation and empowerment of transnational organizations and institutions, international environmental goals regarding carbon dioxide and agreements to fight terrorism, long before 9/11."

Alan: It's because they've always got to have an enemy. We're living the script, and this is only part of the script, the reiteration of the same old script. The bulk of

the population, as you know, are oblivious and they don't care, because they're happily socialized. They can be little children, who can produce and consume and play, never knowing, never awakening in their whole life. In fact, they don't like to be awakened.

You see, it isn't just the elite you have to worry about, the ones at the top, the psychopaths. Those who are aware have also the bulk of the population, who are happily playing themselves and plugging their ears, and, saying to you, "I don't want to hear this."

THE ELITE COULDN'T DO ANYTHING IN THIS WORLD WITHOUT THE COOPERATION OF THE BULK OF THE POPULOUS.

They couldn't pass the laws that take away rights and freedoms, without the acceptance, the acquiescence of the general public. The police couldn't do their "blitzes," as they call them, (a term they borrowed from World War II), their blitzes on the public. That's what they call them in Canada. They're sort of make-work projects for police, as they hire more and more of them and put them all on the roads. They stop you and they smell your breath, check your seatbelt and all the rest of it, to harass you, to train you to obey, obey, obey as they become dominant, rather than servant.

The public must acquiesce to all of this. After all, government itself is only idea, and all forms of governments are only ideas. It takes the acceptance of the vast majority of the public to allow totalitarianism, and, ultimately, always horror to follow. We must give power to the beast, in order to be devoured by the beast, in all ages.

Some of the shows I've been on, in the past, have brought up a common response to the fear of the changes. The common response is "what shall we do to save the people?" because we think in terms of a collective, rather than individualistic. That's our training, in fact. We've all been trained, collectively, to think this way.

The answer is: You can't (even if you could) save the people, collectively; or you would be a tyrant yourself, simply imposing what you thought was the right way to bring the world to whatever your ideas concluded (how people should live, behave, et cetera). **It's the psychopaths, in all eras, who decide for the people which way they'll go, how society will be.** People, individually, in the collective, make decisions every single day of their lives, which affect them and affect others. Being silent affects people. Silence is consent, legally. As long as someone else is getting the boot or the club and not you—that in itself would be the decision you would make.

The choice not to know, the choice to say, "I don't want to hear that" is a choice, is a decision. It's far easier to do the wrong things. Everyone knows, through conscience (if they are not a psychopath), what's right and wrong, but it's much easier to do the wrong than the good.

All sentient people can do is to communicate information to those who seek it, who are waking up to sentience, but lack the facts. Others ask, "What comes after this life?" It's tempting to say, "It depends what you do with this one." Everyone

expects some kind of reward for doing nothing.

Those who seek truth often give up everything that they have to find it. They risk a lot to find it. They become uncomfortable in the milieu in which they live, because those around them, that seem so familiar and close, seem alienated to them now. Because you realize, when you wake up, that everything they say or do is marketed to them, including their opinions and their topics of conversation. Waking up involves the risk of losing those that you thought were closest to you, because you find you don't belong anymore amongst them; and that's been the same in all ages, in all lands.

When Pandora's box is opened, it doesn't come with a guarantee of personal success, in any way, shape or form, because if you're after truth, it doesn't come tailor-made to make you happy. You leave that to those at the top, who created and guide the whole New Age movement. They're the same ones that create the reality for the rest of the people, for the big think tanks; and they're funded by them, too. Yet, even though you go through the phases of waking up and you break through barriers (and yes, you will alter a lot), your mind certainly will expand. And yet you'll find you can take far more of the bad news without buckling under and collapsing, because **there's a strength in knowing**. Not to know is a weakness.

You can't make people wake up. Technically, they've heard many of the things that you have heard yourself on major newscasts, and they've chosen not to dwell on it or think about it. They have actually chosen. They are making choices, all the time, and their choice is often: not to know anymore about it. It's too depressing. You must accept that. Otherwise, you're nagging them; you become an evangelist. Don't expect others to think or to be able to go through those barriers, which you can possibly break through.

For a long, long, long time, in fact, since the so-called "birth of democracy," the public never really had a say in anything. It was a show—a show to stop revolutions occurring. They knew a long time ago that without a show of public input, or choices, in their own destiny, there would be revolutions every few years, so they chose democracy as a sham. As **Quigley** said in "**Tragedy & Hope**," those at the top of all parties are picked and vetted and all belong to the same club. They have for over 100 years or more.

The big foundations and think tanks that work with the bankers, which work with the old, old aristocracy of the world, run your lives and plan your lives and plan the future. They have 10, 15, 20, 50, 100 year plans and 200 year plans. Check out the plans of the communist system. Check out the plans of the United Nations and the ones of the integration of the continents. They all have their long-term agendas, like a big business plan, including what kind of culture they will have at the end of it. They know it, because they will make it so.

So for those who are sentient out there, it's a hard struggle, but you can come through it. Your biggest problem is being isolated from others of your own kind.

From Hamish and myself, it's good night, and may your god or gods go with you.

"The Sounds of Silence"
By Simon and Garfunkel

Hello darkness, my old friend,
I've come to talk with you again,
Because a vision softly creeping,
Left its seeds while I was sleeping,
And the vision that was planted in my brain
Still remains
Within the sound of silence.

In restless dreams I walked alone
Narrow streets of cobblestone,
Beneath the halo of a street lamp,
I turned my collar to the cold and damp
When my eyes were stabbed by the flash of
A neon light
That split the night
And touched the sound of silence.

And in the naked light I saw
Ten thousand people, maybe more.
People talking without speaking,
People hearing without listening,
People writing songs that voices never share
No one dared
Disturb the sound of silence.

Fools, said I, you do not know
Silence like a cancer grows.
Hear my words that I might teach you,
Take my arms that I might reach you.
But my words like silent raindrops fell,
And echoed
In the wells of silence

And the people bowed and prayed
To the neon God they made.
And the sign flashed out its warning,
In the words that it was forming.
And the signs said, the words of the prophets
Are written on the subway walls
And tenement halls.
And whispered in the sounds of silence.

(Transcribed by Linda)